

REMARKS

I. Office Action Summary

Claims 1-19 and 23-35 and 37-47 are pending, (of which claims 1, 16, 23, 27, 31 and 39 are independent). In the Office Action mailed January 28, 2008, the Examiner objected to the specification, rejected claims 1-19 and 41-44 under 35 U.S.C. § 101, and rejected claims 16-19, 23-35, 37-40 and 45-47 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). The Examiner indicated that claims 1-15 and 41-44 include allowable subject matter if the 101 rejections are obviated. After careful review of the cited references, Applicant requests favorable reconsideration in view of the remarks below.

II. Objection to the Specification

The Examiner objected to the specification as allegedly failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter within claim 44, which recites “the most recent document.” The Examiner asserts that there is not any support for this phrase in the disclosure.

Applicant disagrees. The Specification describes at least on page 35, lines 9-15 that content collapsing rules in the automatic normalizer can utilize the previous page loaded to determine if similar constructs exist in a page which can be collapsed into folders or selectable input elements on subsequent loads. This can be performed by comparing the previous page loaded with the current page. (Specification, p. 35).

Applicant requests that the objection to the specification be removed.

III. Response to Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-19 and 41-44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. Appropriate corrections have been made to the claims. Applicant requests that the § 101 claim rejections be removed.

IV. Response to Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 16-19, 23-35, 37-40 and 45-47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by **Bickmore** et al. US006857102B1 filed January 29, 1999, in view of **Hirsch**, US 6,836,768 Provisional No. 60/186,052 filed February 29, 2000. Claims 31-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by **Chen** et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,507,856 filed June 5, 1999, in view of **Hanson** et al. US 20050268224A1. Claim 38 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by **Chen**, in view of **Hanson** and **Bickmore**.

A. Claims 16-19, 27-30 Are Not Obvious Over Bickmore and Hirsch

Independent Claim 16 recites “wherein if a node has no effect on a visual display of the information content and the node is not folder contents, the node is removed.” Independent claim 27 recites similar language. Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Bickmore and Hirsch does not teach or suggest this combination and kindly request the Examiner’s reconsideration.

Applicant’s present invention teaches, for example, nodes that represent a beginning “HTML” tag may not be considered significant since that tag has no effect on presentation, and can be removed. (Spec. page 37, lines 10-17). There is no such teaching within either Bickmore or Hirsch showing a node having “no effect on a visual display of the information content and the node is not folder contents, the node is removed.” Bickmore does not teach or suggest, to make the determination of whether a node has an effect on a visual display, and if not, to remove the node, as recited in claims 16 and 27.

In contrast, Bickmore teaches removing information that cannot physically be displayed on the client device, which is the case when an image is too large to be displayed on the client

device, and in that instance, the node representing the image clearly has an effect on the visual display of the information content. In fact, a node presenting an image is information content that effects the visual display, and because it is removed, Bickmore is squarely contrary to the claim limitation of “wherein if ... the node is **not** folder contents, the node is removed,” as in claim 16 and “removing nodes that do **not** ... represent the information content to be displayed on the device,” as in claim 27. (emphasis added).

Similarly, Hirsch also does not teach or suggest determining whether a node has an effect on a visual display, and if not, to remove the node, as recited in claims 16 and 27. Col. 7, lines 35 - Col. 18, lines 38-53. Surfnotes scans Web pages to match the information content to categories, business and sports. When a user searches a topic, the relevant Surfnotes categories are searched for the required data. Surfnotes’ categorization of content is not related to removing nodes. Like Bickmore above, Hirsch summarizes documents, and in doing so, replaces much of the information present within the original document. Hirsch does not determine whether a node has an effect on a visual display, and if not, to remove the node, as recited in claims 16 and 27.

Since the combination of Bickmore and Hirsch fails to teach or suggest all claim limitations of independent claims 16 or 27, claims 16-19 or 27-30 are not obvious.

B. Claims 23-26, 39-40 and 45-47 Are Not Obvious Over Bickmore and Hirsch

Independent Claim 23 calls for “determining if the information content contains normalization markup, and if so, *utilizing normalization markup in the information content to normalize the information content, wherein the normalization markup provide at least one specific instruction for normalizing the information content*”, or similar language. Independent

claim 39 recites similar language. Applicant submits that the combination of Bickmore and Hirsch also does not teach or suggest this combination.

The Examiner cited Bickmore as allegedly teaching this limitation, stating that Bickmore discusses cascading style sheets (CSS) that define a set of display attributes for different structural portions of a document (e.g., all headings are displaying using red 18-point Times font). However, the Examiner has not asserted, and Bickmore does not teach or suggest, using markup or data “*in the information content itself*” as specific instructions for how to modify the document (“the normalization markup provide at least one specific instruction for normalizing the information content”). For example, the present application describes that general normalization rules may not apply to all web sites, and in such instances, it may be possible to use specified rules provided by the website. (Spec. page 45). The present application teaches that normalization markup is a set of attributes introduced into existing HTML content to trigger the automatic normalization process to perform certain operations. (Spec. pages 45-47). Thus, the normalization markup in the HTML content itself must “provide at least specific instruction for normalizing the information content.” Claims 45-47 also recite further examples of normalization markup functions (Claim 46: “wherein the normalization markup includes meta-tags embedded in the information content”).

Hirsch is also similarly deficient as it does not teach or suggest using specific instructions present within the HTML web page to dictate how to modify the web page for display on the client device. Since the combination of Bickmore and Hirsch fails to teach or suggest all claim limitations of independent claims 23 and 39, this combination does not render claims 23-26, 39-40 or 45-47 obvious.

Applicant also notes that aspects of dependent claims 6-11 and 45-47 include limitations pertaining to use of normalization markup, and are not obvious in view of the cited references for at least this reason alone.

C. Claims 31-35 and 37-38 Are Not Obvious Over Bickmore and Hirsch

The Examiner indicated on page 5 that claims 31-35 and 37-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bickmore and Hirsch, however, the Examiner did not specifically address any of these claims with respect to Bickmore and Hirsch. Rather, the Examiner addressed claims 31-35 and 37-38 as being rejected by other references. Applicant addresses those rejections below.

D. Claims 31-35 and 37 Are Not Obvious Over Chen and Hanson

Claim 31 recites “wherein the plurality of arrays contain values associated with the nodes of the data, and wherein operations on the nodes can be carried out by utilizing the value as referenced to the affected nodes,” and “wherein separate arrays are used to store values representing properties of each node including properties selected from the group consisting of a parent node, a previous sibling node, a next sibling node, and a first child node.” Applicant submits that neither Chen nor Hanson, separately or in combination, teaches or suggests this claim limitation.

The combination of Chen and Hanson does not render independent claim 31 obvious. The Examiner asserts that Chen teaches the limitation “separate arrays are used to store values representing properties of each node . . .” at col. 3 lines 35-65. (Office Action 1.28.08, page 24). Chen, however, teaches parsing a document into a name tag and value pairs in a node tree format or an array format. Col. 3, lines 65-67. Chen does not teach or suggest further storing values

representing properties of each node in separate arrays, including “properties selected from the group consisting of a parent node, a previous sibling node, a next sibling node, and a first child node” as required by Claim 31. In fact, Chen’s teaching of parsing a document into a name tag and value pairs in “one of a node tree format or an array format” is directly contrary to the limitations of Claim 31.

Similarly Hanson uses the word “arrays,” but is talking about arrays as objects for “developing Web documents” to “abstract away the particulars of a computer operating system and hardware upon which the web document is created.” Col. 1, lines 62-65. Thus, Hanson does not discuss storing data pertaining to the nodes at all, and thus fails to teach that “the plurality of arrays contain values associated with the nodes of the data, and wherein operations on the nodes can be carried out by utilizing the value as referenced to the affected nodes.” Hanson does not teach using arrays according to Applicant’s claimed invention, “wherein separate arrays are used to store values representing properties of each node including properties selected from the group consisting of a parent node, a previous sibling node, a next sibling node, and a first child node” as called for by Claim 31.

Since the combination of Chen and Hanson fails to teach or suggest all claim limitations of claim 31, this combination does not render claims 31-35 and 37 obvious.

E. Claim 38 Is Not Obvious Over Chen, Hanson and Bickmore

Applicant submits that the combination of Chen, Hanson and Bickmore fail to teach all limitations of independent claim 31, to which claim 38 depends, as discussed above.

V. Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that, in view of the remarks above, all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant therefore respectfully requests such action. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (312) 913-2134 with any questions or comments.

Respectfully submitted,

McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert & Berghoff LLP

Date: July 28, 2008

By: /Joseph A. Herndon/
Joseph A. Herndon
Reg. No. 50,469